UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/532,919	01/16/2006	Albert Kooiman	DE 020239	4947
	7590 09/26/200 LLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001		SHAH, PARAS D		
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2626		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/532,919	KOOIMAN, ALBERT		
Examiner	A ( 11 14		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	PARA	AS SHAH	2626	
The MAILING DATE of this commu	nication appears on	the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 02 September 2008 FAILS T	O PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION F	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, bu application, applicant must timely file one of application in condition for allowance; (2) a for Continued Examination (RCE) in complications:</li> </ol>	it prior to or on the sai f the following replies: Notice of Appeal (with	me day as filing a Notice of : (1) an amendment, affidavi h appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar it, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the maili no event, however, will the statutory period to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check et MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See	ing date of this Advisory for reply expire later thar either box (a) or (b). ONL	Action, or (2) the date set forth SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.13 have been filed is the date for purposes of determining under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiral set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 3 NOTICE OF APPEAL	the period of extension a tion date of the shortene y the Office later than the	and the corresponding amount ed statutory period for reply original.	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply rAMENDMENTS	i)), or any extension th	nereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a f  (a) They raise new issues that would req  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (s  (c) They are not deemed to place the ap appeal; and/or	uire further considera see NOTE below); plication in better forn	tion and/or search (see NO	TE below); ducing or simplifying th	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims withou NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 of the amendments are not in compliance with the c	and 41.33(a)).			OTOL 224\
<ul><li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following.</li><li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s)</li></ul>	ng rejection(s):			
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed ame how the new or amended claims would be rather status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as faction claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1-13.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	rejected is provided be ollows:		ll be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a because applicant failed to provide a showing was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.1</li> </ol>	ing of good and suffici			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the entered because the affidavit or other evide showing a good and sufficient reasons why</li> </ol>	ence failed to overcom	ne <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
<ul> <li>10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered.</li> <li>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> <li>11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been</li> </ul>	·		·	
See Continuation Sheet.  12. Note the attached Information Disclosure			Toondinon for allowall	oc pecause.
13.				
/Patrick N. Edouard/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626	3	/P. S./ Examiner, Art Unit 2626		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to the Drawing Objections, Figures 1 and 2 were objected to for not supplying textual labels for viewing ease.

In response to the rejections under 35 USC 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, the arguments pointing out to page 6, lines 9-19 of the specification indicating that the speech recognition system can be implemented on a computer and use of software, were persuasive and therefor the rejection has been withdrawn.

In the arguments regarding claims 1 and 10, the Applicant argues that the prior art reference of Polikaitis fails to teach the limitation of reception quality thresholds or noise energy thresholds. Further, the Applicant argues that only energy thresholds are disclosed, where none are reception quality thresholds. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with this assertion. Polikaitis teaches various thresholds as shown in Figures 2 and 3. Further, in col. 5, lines 64-67, col. 7, lines 16-26, col. 8, lines 3-9, and col. 8, lines 47-51, col. 9, where each of the cited section describe the description of what the thresholds are used for. The thresholds are used to determine whether speech recognition will be able to occur problem free. Hence, if the thresholds are satisfied, then speech recognition can be performed problem free (High quality), if not, then there might be errors in the speech recognition based on the conditions of the thresholds (Low Quality), Thus, the thresholds used by Polikaitis directly relate to the quality of the input signal spoken by the user for optimal determination by a speech recognizer.

Thus, Polikaitis teaches all of the limitations set forth in claims 1 and 10. Further, Polikaitis in view of Marx in view of Bridges teaches all of the limitations as in independent claim 9 for the reasons noted above, in claim 1.